economists who would give an exactly—or even nearly—similar list of them. Mr Kitson glances * at a few elementary truths." " Wealth/' he says, "is the product of two prime factors, man and Nature, generally termed labour and land. With an unlimited, or practically unlimited, supply of these two factors, how is it that wealth is and has been hitherto so comparatively scarce ? " But is the supply of " man " unlimited in the sense of man able, willing, and properly trained to work ? And is the supply of " Nature " unlimited in the sense of land, mines, and factories fully equipped with the right machinery and served and supplied by adequate means of transport ? Surely the failure in production on which Mr Kitson so rightly lays stress is due, at least partly, to lack of good workers, good organisers, good machinery, and good transport facilities. Workers who restrict output, employers who despise science and cling to antiquated methods, the opposition of both classes to new and efficient equipment, and large tracts, even of our own land, still without reasonable transport facilities, have something to do with it. And lack of capital—this answer to the question Mr Kitson flouts because, he says, "since capital is wealth/' to say that " wealth is scarce because capital is scarce is the same as saying that wealth is scarce because it is scarce/' But is it not a [u] fundamental

truth of economic science" that capital is wealth applied to production ? Wealth and capital are by no means identical. When a well-known shipbuilding magnate laid waste several Surrey farms to make